UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,969	04/03/2001	Yoshinori Tanabe	1506.1006 (JDH)	9676

21171	7590	11/29/2006

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 September 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6 and 7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6 and 7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 9/11/2006, to the original application

filed 4/30/2001, with priority filing date of **9/21/2000**.

4.   Claims 1-2, 6-7 pending. Claim 8 has been canceled by Applicant. Claims 1, 2, 6-7 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set

forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1, 2, 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al.**

(hereinafter Davis), U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 filed 5/1/1997, issued 8/10/1999, in view of Ono et al.

(hereinafter Ono), U.S. Patent No. 6,964,013 filed 5/30/2000, issued 11/8/2005.

In regard to independent claim 1, Davis teaches an invention which creates/updates HTML

documents via replacement of proprietary extended tags with data, said invention embodied on a medium (Davis

Abstract, column 5 lines 25-33).

Davis teaches reading an HTML document containing a proprietary <RPM> type tag, said HTML

document updated via the replacement of proprietary (i.e. extended) tags <RPM> (said tag type defining various

processing, i.e. <RPMTD>, etc., with said tags themselves not intended to be viewed in a browser) with text

data accordingly (Davis column 5 lines 1-7, column 10 lines 30-41, 64-66, column 11 lines 1-12, column 14

lines 65-67 to column 15 lines 1-44)

Davis teaches the addition of an additional HTML (start and end) tag pair (controlling text bold

parameter <B> - a character style) wrapped around an RPM type tag, said tag pair bolding the text replacing

said RPM type tag (i.e. <B><RPMTD><B>) (Davis column 15 lines 20-29). It is noted that any type of text can

lie between said <B> pair, including pairs of lower element tags, etc (hierarchically based tags).

Davis does not specifically teach "deleting" said <B> tag pair enclosing the above <RPMTD> tag.

However, Ono teaches tag management means (i.e. managing document areas) for managing the deletion of an

HTML tag pair (along with enclosed data) (i.e. a start and end tag) (Ono column 1 lines 63-67, column 7 lines

13-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Ono's

deletion management to Davis's tag pairs, providing Davis the benefit of flexible document editing via

management of nesting or overlapping of <RPMTD> tag data via deletion (see Ono column 2 lines 5-12).

Davis teaches storage/presentation of a final HTML web page to a client via browser subsequent to

updating (Davis Abstract, at bottom, also column 16 lines 61-67).

In regard to independent claim 2, claim 2 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed

in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Davis does not specifically teach an RPM type tag as an extended tag "pair". However, since it is well

known in the hypertext related arts that tags are generally defined in pairs, and that Davis teaches that a tag can

be defined as "any unique set of keyboard symbols used to designate the location and control the placement of

incoming page revisions and also to cause specific tasks to be executed." (Davis column 15 lines 27-33), it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret an RPM tag

as a tag pair, providing Davis the benefit of nesting tag pairs around other data accordingly (compare with claim

2 "...*and said arbitrary text is enclosed by a predetermined identification extended tag pair*".

In regard to independent claim 6, claim 6 reflects the methods comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the medium based program as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 7, claim 7 reflects the apparatus comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the medium based program as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Davis discloses a computer (Davis Figure 1 items 10, 20).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/2006 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach "deleting an HTML tag pair which encloses only an extended tag or which...document". It is respectfully submitted that Davis teaches the addition of an additional HTML (start and end) tag pair (controlling text bold parameter <B> - a character style) wrapped around an RPM type tag, said tag pair bolding the text replacing said RPM type tag (i.e. <B><RPMTD><B>) (Davis column 15 lines 20-29). It is noted that any type of text can lie between said <B> pair, including pairs of lower element tags, etc (hierarchically based tags), or the above element "RPMTD". Davis does not specifically teach "deleting" said <B> tag pair enclosing the above <RPMTD> tag. However, Ono teaches tag management means (i.e. managing document areas) for managing the deletion of an HTML tag pair (along with enclosed data), therefore Ono's deletions are applied to Davis so as to facilitate deletion of the above tags.

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth

in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the

mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this

final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no

event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this

final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be

reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather

Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application

or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

November 26, 2006